

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/628,831	07/31/2000	Michael K. Hargens	1320	5162
28004 SPRINT	7590 08/13/200	8/13/2007 EXAMINER		
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100			BOUTAH, ALINA A	
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2143	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	08/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/628,831	HARGENS ET AL.		
Office A	Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Alina N. Boutah	2143		
The MAILIN Period for Reply	IG DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHICHEVER IS L  - Extensions of time may after SIX (6) MONTHS  - If NO period for reply is  - Failure to reply within the Any reply received by the second s	CTATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAY be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication. It is specified above, the maximum statutory period we set or extended period for reply will, by statute, the Office later than three months after the mailing ustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1) Responsive	to communication(s) filed on 23 Ma	ay 2007.			
2a)⊠ This action i	☑ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.				
,	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in ac	cordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claim	s ·				
4a) Of the ab 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>10</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s)	O-119 is/are pending in the applicate pove claim(s) is/are withdraw is/are allowed. O-119 is/are rejected is/are objected to are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers			•		
9)☐ The specifica	ation is objected to by the Examine	r.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
•	drawing sheet(s) including the correcting declaration is objected to by the Ex				
Priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119				
a) All b) 1. Certifi 2. Certifi 3. Copie	ment is made of a claim for foreign Some * c) None of: lied copies of the priority documents lied copies of the priority documents is of the certified copies of the priority documents ation from the International Bureau hed detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)		<u></u>			
	on's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) re Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2143

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Amendment

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed May 23, 2007. Claims 100-119 are pending in the present application.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 100-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPAP 2002/0046255 issued to Moore et al. (hereinafter referred to as Moore) in view of USPN 5,991,381 issued to Bouanaka et al. (hereinafter referred to as Bouanaka).

Regarding claim 100, Moore teaches a method of providing communication accounts to end-users from a plurality of web sites, the method comprising:

in a first one of the web-sites, interacting with a first one of the end-users over the internet, and in response, transferring a first communication account request over the internet to an account server [0010; 0016];

Art Unit: 2143

selecting a first account code for the first end-user in response to validating the first web site, and transferring the first account code over the internet to the first web site [0006; 0031-0032; 0038];

in the first web-site, transferring the first account code over the internet to the first enduser wherein the first end user uses the first account code to obtain a first communication service from a communication service provider [figures 2 and 3; 0012; 0014; 0015; 0017].

Although Moore does not explicitly teach a second one of the web-sites interacting with second one of the end-users, he teaches providing communication accounts to end-users from multiple web sites (Moore: figure 1, 0005, 0027, 0029). One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the second web-site is identical to that of first web-site.

However, Moore does not explicitly teach in the account server, validating the first website in response to receiving the first communication account request. In an analogous art, Bouanaka teaches a server that validates a request in response to receiving a communication account request (figure 2: 40). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to validate a website in response to receiving a request in order to process user's request automatically, thus allowing users to access the resource.

Regarding claim 101, Moore teaches the method of claim 100 wherein the communication service comprises a prepaid communication service [abstract].

Regarding claim 102, although Moore does not explicitly teaches the method of claim 100 wherein the communication service is a wireless communication service, it would have been

Art Unit: 2143

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the teaching of Moore can be easily applied to wireless communication as well as wired.

Regarding claim 103, Moore teaches the method of claim 100 wherein the communication service comprises an internet access service [0044].

Regarding claim 104, Moore teaches the method of claim 100 wherein the first account code comprises a personal identification number (PIN) [figure 2].

Regarding claim 105, Moore teaches the method of claim 100 wherein the first account code comprises a password [figure 2].

Regarding claim 106, Moore teaches the method of claim 100 wherein the first communication account request identifies the first end-user and the second communication account request identifies the second end-user [0005].

Regarding claim 107, Moore teaches the method of claim 100 wherein the first communication account request identifies a first monetary amount and the second communication account request identifies a second monetary amount [0046].

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 108, Moore teaches the method of claim 100 further comprising, in the account server, selecting a first monetary amount for the first account code and selecting a second monetary amount for the second account code [0046].

Regarding claim 109, the Moore teaches the method of claim 100 further comprising, in the account server, selecting a first time amount for the first account code and selecting time amount for the second account code [0046].

Claims 110-119 are similar to claims 100-109, respectively, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Moore does not teach or suggest a separate account server or communications between a web-site and an account server over the internet as provide for in claims 100 and 110.

The PTO respectfully disagrees and submits that this is taught by Moore and Bouanaka combined. Specifically, Moore teaches a user interacting with a website to access an account over the internet (Moore: 0010 and 0016). In an analogous art, Bouanaka teaches a separate account server and communication between a web-server and an account server. Specifically, figure 1, as well as its corresponding description (col. 2, lines 13-37) teaches a telephone system 20 (interpreted as account server) that receives requests from computer network 10 and validates

Art Unit: 2143

account information. The computer network 10 (interpreted as website) comprises a calling card computer terminal 18 that receives and processes requests from customers 12.

In response to Applicant's allegation that Bouanaka's validation of a request is unimportant, Applicant is reminded that in the core of invention itself, it is not the website, but the user request message (through the web server) that is validated, as evidence by the specification page 7 lines 14-30. In fact, nowhere in the specification discusses any validation of a website.

As argued above, Moore and Bouanaka combined teaches a user interacting with a website to send request to an account server for validation.

### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N. Boutah whose telephone number is 571-272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANB

DAVIO WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100